

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 93 04:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #290
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 10 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 290

Today's Topics:

 Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
 Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat. (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 9 Aug 93 20:01:16 GMT
From: headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>I think his point was that learning Morse code is simply a matter of
>memorization. No additional knowledge or new concepts are learned in going
>from 1 WPM to 40 WPM. In both cases you either know the code or you don't.
>Whether it is recall or recognition has little to do with it. It is still
>rote memorization.

What you seem to be missing is that *every* learning process requires some
rote memorization at the beginning. However, with CW, and unlike the
written exams, rote won't get you beyond the introductory level. Beyond the
rote level (which is 5 wpm), you have to develop the skill of copying
behind, which is an exercise in temporal memory, not long term.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 9 Aug 1993 12:30:14 GMT
From: drt@athena.mit.edu
Subject: Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <23vje0\$ftk@news.delphi.com> greg1@news.delphi.com (Greg Law) writes:
[deleted quotations from Part 97]

Therefore it seems to be legal provided the control operator of the repeater has privileges in the 20 m band and the third-party operator has privileges in the input band (say 2 m), and that the control operator is monitoring -and- controlling the conversation. The stipulation is that the _CONTROL OPERATOR_ must be at the control point and is continuously monitoring and supervising the third party's participation.

Right so far.

However, the _CONTROL POINT_ is defined as the location at which the control operator function is performed. Since a repeater is "an amateur station that automatically retransmits the signals of other stations," it can be argued that a repeater is not the control point. This definition seems to indicate that the control point is the station input to the repeater. At least this is my interpretation.

If anyone has an answer to the contrary and can quote the section of Part 97, I'm all ears. :-)

-- Greg KE4DPX

This can't be right. "When a station is automatically controlled, the control operator need not be present at the control point" (97.109d) Under automatic control, the control point is where the automatic controller is, and the control operator is the repeater licensee. If the control point were the user's transmitter, 2m repeaters would be illegal because you can't run an auxiliary station on 2m (97.201b). This is clearer if we talk about Novices on a 222 repeater. Novices can't control repeaters at all (97.205a), but they can use them, so a user is not the same as a control operator.

With a 10m linked repeater, the third-party issue gets thorny. It's technically illegal - and ridiculously so - to pass a radiogram or any other 3d party traffic on a repeater under automatic control (97.109e). I can't imagine why the FCC cares, because they can hold the repeater user liable for any breach of the rules. Similarly with

foreign countries - no control op on duty means the Technician's chat with a Brit on linked 10m is technically illegal. I have to wonder, though ... do European governments really *care* if a Tech talks to one of their ops via a link? The prospect of some poor government peon wading through the Callbook to determine the class of each licensee, and then checking for upgrades (Techs upgrading to General don't need an identifier on 2m, of course), and then checking to see if there was a control op on duty at the time, is absurd. How much revenue can they be losing through isolated 10m openings which Novices and Techs take advantage of? Zero. So, I guess I wouldn't worry about this - but I'd ID properly for international 3d party traffic, just in case ("G5RV this is KG2S through WR1DRT repeater, clear" 97.115c - note that, since the repeater is talking to G land, you have to ID it *and* the foreign station, as well as yourself, at the end).

These are bad questions to ask the FCC. We might get a clear answer.

-drt

--

David R. Tucker KG2S drt@athena.mit.edu

|'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except |
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

Date: 9 Aug 93 13:00:54 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!gopher.cs.uofs.edu!
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <23vje0\$ftk@news.delphi.com>, gregl@news.delphi.com (Greg Law) writes:

|>
|> 97.205.b A repeater may receive and retransmit only on the 10 m and
|> shorter wavelength frequency bands except the 28.0-29.5 MHz, 50.0-51.0
|> MHz, 144.0-144.5 MHz, 145.5-146.0 MHz, 432.0-433.0 MHz and 435.0-438.0
|> MHz segments.
|>

But according to this you can't have a repeater input or output on a frequency below 29.500 Mhz anyway. It might be covered by rules for remote-bases, but the the third party rules still make it an awfully risky proposition.

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Rearden" Francisco
bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
University of Scranton |
Scranton, Pennsylvania | #include <std disclaimer.h>

Date: 9 Aug 1993 07:51 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!ra!
cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.07.9308021206.A22263-9100000@uafhp.uark.edu>,
<1993Aug2.225832.14836@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Aug5.185641.17424@Csl.Stanford.EDU>ov
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah)

In article <1993Aug5.185641.17424@Csl.Stanford.EDU>, paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes...
>In <5AUG199311362491@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH
FRANZ STOCKER) writes:
>>Lastly, the greatest memorization test is the CW test. Because once you
>>MEMORIZE the letters the speed of recall is the only test. Just ROTE
>>memorization. (sorry I added this to a comment on yours Gary given your
>>stated view on the subject - however, it did need saying).
>
>While that might be true for the 5 wpm exam, that approach won't work for
>the 13 wpm and higher exams. Recall per se has very little to do with
>recognition; short term memory capacity is the primary determinant.
>The CW exam, in contrast to the written, is a test of skill, not of memory.
>
>--
>--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
>->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

That is nonsense. Everything having to do with memory is recall; whether
at 5 or 13wpm. The issue has to do with how quickly you can recall the
sound. I'm not talking about memorizing dots and dashes but memorizing
sound. There is no more skill in this than in memorizing a tune. Just
because one can memorize a tune doesn't make one a Mozart. Just because one
can memorize morse code, doesn't make one a ham operator. There are no
problem solving skills in morse code, just fast recall.

Erich
N30XM

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #290
